



DOCKET ITEM # 2 A&B

Master Plan Amendment #2011-0001
Text Amendment #2011-0005
Waterfront Small Area Plan

Issue: Initiate and consider an amendment to the City's Master Plan to include the Waterfront Small Area Plan chapter, and initiate and consider a text amendment to Section 5-500 of the Zoning Ordinance for the W-1/Waterfront mixed use zone	Planning Commission Hearing:	April 5, 2011 May 3, 2011
	City Council Hearing:	May 14, 2011
Staff: Karl Moritz, Deputy Director karl.moritz@alexandriava.gov Nancy Williams, Principal Planner nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov		

CITY COUNCIL ACTION, JANUARY 21, 2013: City Council adopted the draft waterfront small area plan dated July 2011, incorporating the recommendations from the Planning Commission and the Waterfront Work Group and City staff has outlined in the memo dated January 17, 2012, as an amendment to the City's master plan and a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Section 5.500 of the W-1 Waterfront Mixed Use zone, request the City Attorney to prepare the necessary ordinance and direct staff to proceed with implementation planning as directed in the report, with the following amendments: 1. on page 122, add a new sentence at the end of Parking recommendation 4:34 (d), which states: Testing and monitoring the effect of waterfront development on residential parking areas, with the understanding that additional protective measures should be taken to protect those residential areas. Add a new sentence to read: New residential parking controls, such as restricting parking to permit holders after 6:00 p.m., should be considered an implementation priority. 2. Add language to both the permitted and the special use lists: Uses that foster art, history, and cultural awareness through increased understanding and training, such as museums, schools and cultural institutions. Any use of 5,000 square feet requires a special use permit. 3. add the word "preferably" in Section 3.69 regarding eminent domain. 4. that it limit to two hotels in the whole waterfront plan, with a total limit of 300 rooms with 150 rooms per hotel in the entire W-1 zone. 5. cross referencing on height limits, to add specificity to the language so each parcel has the height limits clearly stated into the master plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, MAY 3, 2011:

MPA #2011-0001

On a motion by Commissioner Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Dunn, the Planning Commission voted to initiate the Master Plan Amendment. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Fossum voting against.

On a motion by Commissioner Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Robinson, the Planning

Commission voted for the following amendments:

- To limit the hotel use described in the Plan to boutique hotels, defining it as no more than 150 rooms and limited meeting space;
- To emphasize that the Plan's proposal for the foot of King Street, including a new public pier and Fitzgerald Square, is the optimal design while acknowledging the potential value of interim options
- To include a hotel and restaurant policy in the plan with guidelines for the review of restaurants, hotels, and other commercial uses to ensure that community concerns are addressed; and
- Other amendments recommended by staff in the May 3 memorandum to the Commission.

The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Fossum voting against.

On a motion by Commissioner Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Robinson, the Planning Commission approved the Master Plan Amendment by resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Fossum voting against.

TA #2011-0005

On a motion by Commissioner Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Lyman, the Planning Commission voted to initiate the Text Amendment. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Fossum voting against.

On a motion by Commissioner Wagner, seconded by Commissioner Jennings, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Text Amendment. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Fossum voting against.

Reason: The Planning Commission endorses the Waterfront Plan, saying that it balances the aspirational with the practical by setting forth a strong and clear vision for a world-class waterfront that is also technically and financially attainable; that it meets the needs of all Alexandrians while safeguarding nearby neighborhoods; that it adds more open space than it does new development; that it finds multiple avenues to bring Alexandria's history back to life along the water; and that it addresses major challenges such as flooding and parking in cost-effective and harmonious ways. It creates a waterfront that keeps what Alexandrians love the most, and it provides a clear path forward to achieving what they have been missing. Over the last 2 years and 100 meetings, Alexandrians were unequivocal about what they wanted for their waterfront and this plan delivers on those goals in an inspired and practical way.

Speakers:

James McCall, Alexandria Archaeological Commission, asked that the plan be deferred so that the community can review a new version of the document with all the changes proposed, including AAC's.

John Gosling, President, Old Town Citizens Association, said that OTCA has not taken a position on the changes, including options for the ODBC parking lot, and asked for a delay so it can review the information.

Eric DeSoto, Board Chairman, Old Dominion Boat Club, discussed the history of the ODBC as a charitable club, the fact that the parking lot is the only boat yard left in Alexandria, and the ODBC's plan to make improvements to the property. He noted that settlement efforts took place to end the federal law suit but that on January 11, 2011 a court decision confirmed that the ODBC is the property owner of 1 and 2 King Street, with riparian rights. He raised concerns about whether the Planning Commission's decision affects ODBC's rights to improve its property and about the City rezoning or master planning the ODBC property from the WPR zone to a public use zone could be considered unreasonable and confiscatory. He explained that ODBC representatives have met during the past month with City staff and Planning Commissioners to discuss conceptual ideas for the parking lot. He described the two options published by the staff and indicated that ODBC had agreed they could be published, although ODBC would continue to talk to staff about concerns they have with Option B. He also added that the Eisenhower boat storage and the Torpedo Factory docks were identified as incentives to ODBC to allow public access along the water and to allow parts of the parking lot to be made smaller.

Andrew MacDonald, 217 Columbus Street, objected to the plan and requested a deferral.

Van Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, identified himself as the only dissenting voice on the Waterfront Committee support for keeping Fitzgerald Square in the plan. He also objects to the 3-4 hotels and the marina at Robinson Terminal South and supports a deferral.

Peter Pennington, Vice Chairman, Waterfront Committee, recommended that Fitzgerald Square remain in the plan along with ideas about solving the ODBC parking lot issue.

Beal Lowen, 321 South Lee Street, said the ODBC is the only remaining boat yard in the City and the club is committed to being good citizens; he believes Option A is a good option.

Michael Peck, 420 N. Union Street, thinks the ODBC members are good citizens and spoke about Virginia law granting certain legal rights to citizens who live within 300 feet of a property.

William Rogalski, Jr., 408 Hanson Lane, raised concerns about the cost of the plan and requested a deferral so that more information could be obtained.

Julie Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, asked for a deferral so that the community has more time to consider the ODBC options.

Boyd Walker, Chair, Greater Alexandria Preservation Alliance, referred to a petition against the rezoning of the waterfront including hotels, increased density and adjustments to the height restrictions. He asked that the hotels be taken out of the plan before moving forward.

Elizabeth Baldwin, 428 N. Union Street, referred to a lawsuit she and several of her neighbors brought against the Washington Post and stated they will continue to pursue the case if the Planning Commission continues to pursue hotels at Robinson Terminal.

Sarita Schotta, 104 Prince Street, expressed concern about congestion, traffic, noise, bus and

parking issues that residents along the waterfront face.

Bert Ely, 200 S. Pitt Street, asked for a deferral to review new information, including the restaurant/hotel policy, and expressed continuing concerns about costs and revenues of the plan.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, referred to his testimony on the plan last month that included alternative schemes for the foot of King Street. He indicated Option B, with some modifications, is closer to his preference for the foot of King Street.

Robert Montague, 207 Prince Street, Vice President of the Northern Virginia Conservation Council, stated that he has been involved in the waterfront planning process since 1973 beginning with Founders Park. He asked for a deferral and raised concerns about open space. He added that he believes the ODBC should be a part of the waterfront plan but that hotels and parking lots should not.

Bill Schaeffer, 327 N. St. Asaph, compared the plan to National Harbor and stated that she thinks Option A is better because she does not want to see cars at the foot of King Street.

John Bly, 418 N. Union Street, raised concerns about legal costs and lower property values if the zoning for Robinson Terminal is changed.

Katy Cannady, 20 East Oak Street, prefers Options A and B to Fitzgerald Square because they are less expensive. She asked why the FAR is still being increased from 2.0 to 3.0 for hotels on the development sites if Fitzgerald Square is no longer there.

Jeremy Taylor, 213 S. Royal Street, objects to both Options A and B and asked that the entire plan be rejected because the plan was done in a clandestine manner and contains too much density.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, APRIL 5, 2011: The Planning Commission closed the public hearing and continued the discussion of the Master Plan Amendment and Text Amendment to the May 3 hearing. Chairman Komoroske stated that the Planning Commission may reopen the public hearing if deemed necessary.

Speakers:

Bert Ely, 200 South Pitt Street, spoke in opposition, raising questions about permitting issues, congestion and costs. He suggested the plan adoption be postponed.

Judy Noritake, representing the Parks and Recreation Commission, spoke in support of the Plan, describing it as a park plan that integrates art, history and commerce. She stressed the fact that the Commission is geographically representative of the entire City, and spoke to the importance of park maintenance and a profitable marina.

Andrew MacDonald, 217 N. Columbus Street, spoke in opposition as a private citizen. He thought there should be options such as more parkland instead of hotels and economic models for

the options. He criticized the process as not involving residents. As a member of HARC, he submitted a letter from that Commission stating support of the art and history components of the Plan.

Nathan Macek, Chair, Waterfront Committee, spoke in support of the Plan as necessary to guide redevelopment and City investments, and providing a balance between economic development and parks. He added several suggestions related to parking, balance of uses, density controls, the Waterfront Park building and funding for Windmill Hill Park.

Michael Wenk, Alexandria House HOA, spoke in support and said the concerns expressed by the speakers, including flood control, open space, connectivity, access, history, development, and regulatory controls, have been included in the Plan.

John Gosling, President, Old Town Civic Association, spoke in opposition, citing a recent OTCA poll reflecting the need to reduce density and to include more open space, a stronger commitment to civic/cultural uses, limits on commercial uses including hotel rooms, the elimination of the Waterfront Park building and a demonstration that the Plan is revenue neutral.

Andrew Palmieri, Chairman-elect, Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the Plan, citing a long public participation process, the fact that the Plan is consistent with the City's Economic Sustainability Plan, and that development in the Plan is needed to make it economically sustainable.

Tina Leone, President and CEO, Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support. She explained that the Chamber, representing 900 businesses with half of those businesses resident-owned, considers the waterfront an asset for the entire City and hotels to be good uses because they have lower impacts and higher revenues than alternative uses.

Bill Lowen, 321 S. Lee Street, expressed concern about the process, and objection to the idea of a promenade along the River. He thought the process should be slowed down and that decisions are being made without good data.

Charlotte Hall, representing the Alexandria Convention and Visitors Association, spoke in support of the Plan. She stated it is consistent with the City's Economic Sustainability Plan and the Council's Strategic Plan, and it will create a world class waterfront. She added that as Vice President of the Potomac Riverboat Company, she supports an expanded commercial marina, indicating that PRC now docks three boats at National Harbor because the City's current marina lacks space.

Jody Manor, owner of Bittersweet restaurant and ACVA board member, spoke in support, citing the extensive public participation and the enhancement of public access and public open space. He stated that the waterfront today does not serve as the cultural, public or economic asset it should be. He indicated that ACVA urges support of the Plan in its entirety so that the waterfront can achieve its potential as a recreational resource and economic tool.

John Renner, business owner and Chair of the Public Affairs Committee of the ACVA, spoke in support of the Plan generally and of the concept of hotel use and tourism specifically. He stated that hotels promote public access to the water, generate 6 times the revenue that residential uses do, and cited the recent investment of \$400 million by hotels in Alexandria.

Kenneth Wire, McGuire Woods, representing the owner of the Sheet Metal Workers building, requested that the Plan be amended to reference the potential for a rezoning for that site that is compatible with uses in the Plan should the building redevelop in the future.

James McCall, Chair, History Plan Committee of the Alexandria Archeological Commission, expressed AAC's support of the history component of the Plan, and suggested a series of specific additions and changes to the text.

Miles Holtzman, President, Old Dominion Boat Club, asked to preserve the right to speak at the May Planning Commission meeting and stated that the City and ODBC were currently in discussion regarding possible options for the foot of King Street.

Lauren Garcia, Vice Chair, Alexandria Economic Development Partnership, indicated the AEDP Board supports and urges adoption of the Plan, stating that the Plan includes unique open space and other improvements that will benefit a variety of stakeholders and will draw investment to help pay for the improvements.

Boyd Walker, Alexandria Preservation Alliance, spoke in opposition to the Plan and expressed concern about the Plan's lack of concern about history and historic sites on the Waterfront.

Matthew Harwood, Alexandria Commission for the Arts, spoke in support of the Plan's incorporation of public art, but raised concern about finding a new home for the Art League.

Bill Harvey, 2151 Jamieson Avenue, raised concern about the Plan as a whole indicating it is not tied to Alexandria and a concern that the proposed piers would be exposed to ice, currents flotsom and jetsam. He proposed a scaled down version of the piers.

Van Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, supports the Plan's deferral indicating it has no backing from residents, and stating a need for an economic analysis, regulatory approvals have not been obtained, the piers are too long, replacement parking for Dandy and Chadwicks' is needed, and too much density has been proposed--including space for 14 Virtue size equivalent restaurants. He recommended implementation of flood mitigation and bulkhead repairs now.

William Rogalski, Jr., 408 Hansen Lane, spoke against the Plan, suggesting a deferral so that a smaller plan could be devised with the necessary cost/benefit analysis.

Bruce Miller, 410 Hansen Lane, encouraged the Commission to get answers to the questions raised at the hearing.

Woody Morris, American Medical Group, One Prince Street, supports an improved waterfront but objects to a building in Waterfront Park.

Bob Wood, 711 Potomac Street, recommended caution because he sees the Plan as one for economic development only.

Val Hawkins, President and CEO, AEDP, spoke in support. He has been a resident of Alexandria for 37 years and noted the monumental work that went into this Plan by staff, citizens and the various involved stakeholders. He stated the AEDP adopted a resolution in support of the Plan stating its consistency with the City's Strategic Plan and Economic Sustainability Plan.

Poul Hertel, 1271 Michigan Court, provided an alternative Plan with the Beachcomber as the cultural center, housing a museum with possibly a restaurant. He recommended that the Waterfront Park building be removed and the ODBC parking lot remain but in modified form.

Julie Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, also recommended an alternative from the Waterfront Alliance that does not include hotels, but does include flood control and uses the Robinson Terminal South location for a maritime museum, the Seaport Foundation, an art museum and the Archeological Museum. She suggested thinking outside the box on the Cummings and Robinson Terminal North sites.

Robert Riker, 118 Waterford Place, raised questions about the value of Robinson Terminal, private marina development, ODBC piers, and commercial boating generally.

Katy Cannady, 20 East Oak, spoke against the Plan, stating it violates the Waterfront Park settlement agreement and did not include an interactive citizen's participation process.

Joe Demshar, 302 Prince Street, raised issues about the vision for the waterfront and the cost of the Plan.

Dana de Montigny, 302 Prince Street, spoke against the Plan and the density, arguing that changing the waterfront would change Old Town and its authenticity.

Michael Hobbs, 419 Cameron Street, discussed the fact that there are many areas of consensus in the Plan, but scale and density are points of contention.

John Bly, 418 N. Union Street, stated there is a need for more meetings in order to have greater dialogue and a consensus Plan.

Michael Vea, 420 N. Union Street, opposed the Plan; he has studied the Plan and it will drive him out of Alexandria if adopted; he is concerned about the use of Robinson Terminal North as a hotel.

I. BACKGROUND

The Waterfront Plan proposed for adoption is the culmination of a great effort, over two years, and many people's involvement. The Department of Planning and Zoning began the planning process in April 2009. Extensive community outreach, including some 100 small group, community-wide, and staff meetings have occurred. There have been activities such as charrettes, tours, and topical nights on art, history, and the marina. The Planning Commission and City Council have conducted work sessions and briefings on the Plan's overall content as well as specific issues.

Technical expertise was also applied during the planning process in the areas of marine engineering; flood mitigation; architecture, park and public space design through staff and consultants; hotel and marina market assessments through consultants; preliminary regulatory and permitting analysis through consultants and communication with the District of Columbia, the Corps of Engineers, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the National Park Service (NPS) for pier and marina expansion; parking and traffic analysis through consultants; production of Art and History Waterfront Plans by the City's art and history communities; and more. The Plan also benefited from the *Old Town Area Parking Study*, the *Potomac River Waterfront Flood Mitigation Study*, and the *Waterfront Traffic Impact Study*, with results integrated into the Plan.

The public outreach meetings and activities along with technical expertise facilitated a vision to create a 21st century waterfront that meets the needs of residents and visitors alike and that is sustainable economically and environmentally. The vision then helped to shape a series of illustrative designs for redevelopment of the waterfront.

Although the Plan looks toward the future, it is also bolstered by past planning efforts, all of which share the goals of a publicly-oriented and accessible waterfront; multi-modal connectivity via a walkway and bicycle trail; creation of parks and open space; and redevelopment of remaining development sites through a mixture of uses to promote an active waterfront. While some objectives have been realized, the Plan's overarching goal is to enhance what has been accomplished to-date by:

- expanding the provision of open and public space;
- strengthening the visual and physical connectivity along the waterfront;
- generating more water-oriented and related public activity along the waterfront;
- fostering adaptive reuse of historic buildings; and
- guiding redevelopment of the limited remaining development sites.

II. ISSUES

During the planning process, several key issues were discussed, and remain critical to any conversation about the waterfront. Additionally, City Council, during a work session on February 8, 2011, highlighted a series of issues for further, more detailed review: flood mitigation, parking, a smaller scale Waterfront Park Building, and implementation issues such as costs/revenues and phasing. Information was released on March 23, 2011 to the public, regarding those items, and it is also provided in this staff report as Attachments 7, 8, 9 and 10 respectively. Summaries of these and other issues/solutions are included below.

A. Flood Mitigation

Participants in the planning process urged that a solution to the frequent flooding in Old Town be included in the Plan. The Plan reflects the flood mitigation approach determined to be the most cost effective, and it incorporates those solutions into improvements to parks and public spaces. Flood mitigation will be one of the first priorities for Plan implementation.

In 2007, the Transportation & Environmental Services Department conducted an initial assessment of flooding along the City of Alexandria's waterfront within the Potomac River watershed. That assessment led to the *2010 Potomac River Waterfront Flood Mitigation Study* to determine the causes of the flooding problem, identify potential solutions, analyze these potential solutions and recommend the best solutions. Three flood levels were examined in the study: [Nuisance (4 feet NAVD88), Intermediate (8 feet NAVD88) and Extreme (100-year, 10.2 feet NAVD88)].

The flood study area is bounded by Third Street to the north, Fairfax Street to the west, the Capital Beltway to the south, and the Potomac River to the east and, then, is further divided into four focus areas: Jones Point, King Street, Waterfront Commercial, and North Union.

Twenty-seven flood mitigation measures were identified and discussed in a series of public and staff meetings that occurred from October 2007 through November 2008. During that process, a numerical scoring system was developed to select mitigation measures to consider further. The following nine mitigation measures were selected for detailed evaluation using this scoring system.

- *Structural measures:* provide dry flood proofing; acquire properties; elevate structures; construct engineered structural barriers (i.e., waterfront floodwall and Jones Point berm); construct an elevated walkway that would also be a floodwall structure; and increase the inlet and road elevation in the vicinity of the Lower King Street area.

- *Nonstructural measures:* relocate internal supplies, products/goods above the flooding depth; improve the City's floodplain and zoning ordinances; and improve the sandbag programs or provide other temporary flood deterrents

A benefit-cost analysis (BCA) was performed for the six structural mitigation measures. A BCA was not computed for the proposed nonstructural mitigation measures. Therefore, nonstructural mitigation measures were evaluated only for applicability and technical feasibility. The historic nature of the City adds to the cost and complexity of the mitigation measures considered. Additionally, conceptual designs were developed for the floodwall, Jones Point berm, the elevated walkway, and roadway improvements.

After considerable analysis of different flood levels and a variety of potential flood mitigation areas, the study found that the most cost-effective level of protection is 6 feet NAVD88, which has a recurrence interval of approximately 10 years. At higher protection elevations, the physical size and cost of the work increases dramatically, and BCA drops quickly.

The study does not recommend a single flood mitigation solution, but rather a series of measures are recommended to provide protection against flood events on the Potomac River, including several of the structural measures that can be constructed by the City: (1) inlet and roadway improvements along King Street, Union Street and The Strand; (2) an elevated walkway approximately 1,280 feet in length; and (3) approximately 550 feet of floodwall. An additional recommendation involves flood proofing private properties that are currently vulnerable to nuisance flooding. This idea would require participation from private property owners, although the City can provide expertise and guidance.

The Plan incorporates the three recommended structural flood mitigation measures as follows: The first, inlet and roadway improvements include raising the roadway elevation and associated drainage structures in the vicinity of the intersections of King Street and The Strand and King Street and Union Street. The City encounters flooding in these areas due to storm drain and because of the low elevations of the catch basins. The improvements would raise the roadway by approximately a foot to one and a half feet, as well as raising storm drain manholes and catch basins, reducing the most frequent occurrences of flooding in this area. The frequency of shallow nuisance flooding could be reduced from over 150 times a year to about 10 times a year, depending on the roadway elevations that are achieved.

In the case of the second and third structural recommendations, namely an elevated walkway and floodwall system, the Plan includes a variation of these so that, instead of the full structures being located along the promenade, blocking the river view, they are in part naturally incorporated into the parks and landscape along this area. The layout of these structural elements is shown in concept in this Plan. The exact

locations will be developed in the implementation phase as more extensive engineering analysis and design takes place.

The effectiveness of the proposed flood protection up to Elevation 6.0 is dependent upon the entire limits of the mitigation being constructed. If the improvements are phased in over time, the flood protection will not be realized until the final phase is completed. More information regarding flood mitigation is included in Attachment 7 – Flood Mitigation Measures and Graphics.

B. Parking

Early in the planning process, many people identified parking as a critical issue that would have to be fully addressed for the Plan to succeed. The Plan includes a comprehensive approach to Old Town parking management.

In the past year, the City prepared a comprehensive study of Old Town parking supply and demand, developed recommended strategies based on the new information, worked through the summer with a community stakeholder group to prioritize solutions, and began their implementation. Enforcement has been increased, new parking wayfinding signs will be installed this spring, and new multi-space parking meters are being installed.

The Old Town parking initiatives have been conducted jointly with waterfront planning, which the Plan describes in some depth on pages 114-121.

A key finding is that – even at peak times -- there are many unused parking garage spaces within 3-4 blocks of the King/Union intersection. This finding made it clear that there is a big opportunity to improve Old Town parking by getting people to use garages, especially when parking for more than a few hours.

The Plan shows that, numerically, existing parking demand and capacity leave room to park any increase in cars attracted to the waterfront. There are more than 700 unused spaces available today at peak times in public garages; additional close-by private garages are willing to open for public parking when and if there is demand. Adding garage attendants and valet parking programs to the toolbox increases garage capacity even more.

Beyond its parking analysis, however, the Plan recognizes that having theoretical capacity is only part of the answer; action steps need to be taken and then continued into the future so that an assessment of parking can be made and steps taken to address parking on a regular basis.

Specifically, the Plan would formally extend and continue the progress made in the past year on Old Town parking issues through a Waterfront Parking Implementation Plan. The Parking Implementation Plan would be both a living document and a public

process to monitor conditions, evaluate options, and take action. The Parking Implementation Plan must include specific triggers, such as development activity or renewed utilization/capacity studies, with the necessary enhanced capacity that must be available. This level of detail and commitment by the City to the Plan's outline for the future is absolutely required. The Plan, on page 120, lists specific measures which, at a minimum, must be included in any Implementation Plan, including:

- Monitoring public garage capacity at peak times on a regular basis and using an 85% capacity measure to trigger the need to make additional capacity available;
- Requiring additional parking capacity at the point that new demand generators are constructed on the waterfront;
- Implementing a systematic valet parking program for Old Town, King Street and the waterfront core area;
- Protecting parking in residential areas after testing and monitoring the effects of waterfront development.

The Plan calls for an interagency team with support by affected stakeholders to create the Parking Implementation Plan. Additional summary information on parking is in Attachment 8 – Parking Summary.

C. Proposed Waterfront Park Restaurant Building

No Plan recommendation has inspired as much debate as the proposal to construct a building along the western edge of Waterfront Park. The Waterfront Park building was initially proposed for three main reasons:

- It would both *finance* and *hide* a replacement surface parking lot for the Old Dominion Boat Club...and, in the process, result in a larger amount of open space at the heart of the waterfront.
- Proposed for restaurant use, it would provide additional options for waterfront dining, something identified early on by Alexandrians as one of the things they wanted most from the Plan.
- It would activate Waterfront Park and connect King Street to The Strand redevelopment sites.

The Plan document proposes two options for a restaurant building within Waterfront Park. Both options yield approximately 30,000 square feet of development. Staff was asked to develop a smaller option.

The new proposal, developed at the request of the City Council and community, is for a much smaller scale building: narrower, not as long, and much shorter in height. The conceptual design is a largely glass structure, taking architectural cues from the Mount Vernon orangery, resulting in a low-slung market style building which activates Waterfront Park and is better integrated into the neighborhood fabric. The building's design creates a large roof top space suitable for seasonal outdoor dining, offering panoramic views of the Potomac River.

The proposed building is approximately 60 feet in depth and 175 feet in length along The Strand, yielding approximately 10,500 square feet. It would leave more than 180 feet of park depth from shoreline to the new building, thereby extending far less (35 feet less) into the park than earlier designs. The exterior façade of the building, with exception of two gable elements, is only 14 feet high above the adjacent walkway fronting Waterfront Park, and steps back to a maximum height of 18 feet at the roof parapet. This lower height mitigates most of the potential view blocking of rear-facing tenants in the adjacent buildings.

A building at this location is important because it would help connect the waterfront between King Street and points south and north along the waterfront by enlivening the area, drawing people into the park, providing them with opportunities for outdoor and indoor dining, and affording them great views of people along the adjacent walkway, Point Lumley Park, and the water and marinas. Finally, a restaurant would provide sufficient tax revenues to significantly contribute to the high level of maintenance required for expanded parkland and public space envisioned by the Plan. More information regarding the new smaller scale option for the Waterfront Restaurant Building is in Attachment 9 - Waterfront Park Restaurant Building.

D. Plan Costs and Revenues

The great majority of recommendations in this Plan call for additions and improvements to waterfront public spaces, the shoreline, and the marina. Because there are few redevelopment sites on the waterfront, many people expressed concern that the potential revenues from new development would not be sufficient to support the Plan's recommendations.

The Plan is able to balance costs and revenues, including enhanced maintenance levels, by carefully calibrating permitted densities and land uses to be those which generate the greatest public benefits with the lowest neighborhood impacts. The following summarizes anticipated costs and revenues associated with the Plan, as does Attachment 10 – Waterfront Costs/Revenues and Phasing:

- The Plan balances costs and revenues.
- At build-out, a redevelopment scenario with a mixture of housing, hotel, and restaurant/retail yields net tax revenue of \$4.8 million in 2011 dollars

per year. With a phased build-out over 15 years, cumulative tax revenues at the end of 15 years will reach \$42 million in 2011 dollars.

- The park and public space improvements recommended in the Plan would cost up to \$39 million while flood mitigation would cost \$6.5 million (all in 2011 dollars). Even including flood mitigation, the Plan's projected revenues will exceed expenditures within 20 years.
- Once public improvements are made, \$1.0 million of the net tax revenue per year can be used to help the City maintain the new improvements and improve maintenance on existing parks.
- Hotels are a major reason why the Plan can pay for itself. On average, a square foot of hotel space generates six times the tax revenue of a square foot of housing.
- Over the past month, City staff extensively validated the cost estimates for the Plan with government and private industry experts. The analysis included comparisons to recent and current waterfront projects at National Harbor, Washington DC, and Arlington.
- Numerous figures were double-checked and some figures were adjusted, but only a few changes were substantial:
 - About \$4.7 million was added to the contingency fund and engineering cost estimates. In the interest of being extra conservative, City staff chose to increase the contingency fund from 15% to 30% of total cost and increase the expected design/engineering cost from 15% to 20%.
 - The proposed civic/cultural building rose in price from \$1.6 million to \$3.6 million. Smaller or less expensive buildings are possible; the new estimate shows the cost of a high quality 10,000 square foot building.
 - Completing flood mitigation at the same time as other improvements provide some cost savings.
 - Operating costs have been included in the cost/revenue calculation. The cost/revenue scenario contains an increase of \$1 million per year in operating costs over current levels by year 11. That figure would cover not only increased operating costs due to new facilities, but also an increased level of maintenance for existing parks, public spaces, and marina areas.

- The capital costs of the Plan include the purchase of a waterborne debris skimmer and the operating costs cover additional staff for its operation.

E. Plan Phasing Program

There is considerable flexibility in how waterfront improvements could be phased. The proposed phasing would prioritize flood mitigation, improvements that provide *both* public amenities *and* economic value, and improvements at the heart of the waterfront: the foot of King Street.

Staff divided the Waterfront into 10 “phasing locations.” Public Improvements that are logically completed at the same time were grouped into elements. The cost and relative timing of each element is estimated.

- The timeframes for phasing are: 0-3 years, 4-6 years, and 7-15 years.
- Flood mitigation is a high priority.
- The phasing analysis anticipates that the King Street/The Strand/Union Street flood mitigation work and the Point Lumley Park improvements, including floodwall elements, would be completed in the first three years, the Fitzgerald Square/Waterfront Park initiatives in years 4-6, and the balance of the recommended improvements in years 7-15. However, the timing of the phasing elements is very flexible and can respond to opportunities that may occur. For example, if agreement is reached on the Old Dominion Boat Club parking lot issue, then the Fitzgerald Square and Waterfront Park initiatives could accelerate and Point Lumley Park initiatives could be scheduled later.
- Public art and historic interpretation could occur in any phase, but will also be considered as part of any of the proposed improvements.

For the mixed use redevelopment scenario noted under costs/revenues above, it is also anticipated that redevelopment will occur in the three identified phases as well: 0-3 years, 4-6 years, and 7-15 years.

- In years 0-3, anticipated redevelopment includes the Beachcomber, redevelopment of the Cummings warehouse at 220 South Union Street, and adaptive reuse of the historic buildings in that block.
- In years 4-6, anticipated redevelopment includes Robinson Terminal North and the balance of the redevelopable properties in the Cummings/Turner block.

- In years 7-15, the anticipated redevelopment is Robinson Terminal South.

More information on costs/revenues/phasing is contained in Attachment 10 – Costs/Revenues/Phasing.

F. Hotels

The Plan does not *require* hotels. The Plan would *permit* hotels, and would *encourage* hotels in locations where the public should feel welcome.

- The mixed use redevelopment scenario includes 625 hotel rooms spread over the three sites: 250 at Robinson Terminal South, 200 at Robinson North, and 175 in the Cummings/Turner block.
 - The actual number of hotel rooms constructed will depend on many factors, including market conditions, developer interest, and public participation in the development review process.
 - If built, the hotels could yield fewer rooms than anticipated or involve smaller hotels.
 - To help illustrate a potential hotel: a 250-room hotel on Robinson Terminal South could be similar to the Hotel Monaco near Market Square. The Hotel Monaco is a good neighbor: while there is cab activity at the entrance, King Street is not congested; hotel activity does not congest the nearby sidewalks; the hotel is quiet; and the hotel appears to accommodate the parking demand it generates.
 - Reducing the number of hotel rooms to 500 (replaced with housing) would reduce net annual revenues available to pay for the Plan from \$4.8 million to \$3.5 million per year. Reducing hotel rooms to 375 would further reduce net annual revenues to \$2.8 million.
- Hotel uses have reduced impacts on traffic and parking. Hotels generate fewer trips than many other non-residential uses (such as office and retail) and these trips are spread out over the day, rather than concentrated during rush hours. Hotels also demand fewer parking spaces, as a large share of guests arrive by means other than driving a car that needs to be parked.
- A 2011 *Hotel Technical Memorandum* prepared by W-ZHA is included in the Plan as Appendix 3; it covers an area defined for study purposes as East Alexandria; rooms for this area currently totals 2,780 according to Smith Travel Research. These properties maintained an effective 2009

occupancy of just over 70%, which is considered healthy by industry standards.

- There is only one hotel included in the Plan study area, namely the Crowne Plaza. Due to current zoning restrictions on land use, there is no opportunity to create high quality lodging along the Potomac River in Alexandria. The Plan and a rezoning as outlined in Section IV would allow hotels under the W-1 zone for development sites in the planning area with an SUP. This will allow access to this yet untapped and highly desirable feature of Old Town. Redevelopment sites identified the Plan will be afforded a geographic premium unavailable to any other property in the City.

More summary information on hotels is included in Attachment 11 – Hotel Use Analysis.

III. KEY PLANNING ELEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT SITES

A. Planning Elements

There are several key planning elements which are integral to the Plan's ability to enhance past and present goals of expanding public access, parkland, and connectivity; improving public amenities to enliven the waterfront through water-based and land-based activity; incorporating the use of art and history; increasing the waterfront's financial and environmental sustainability; preserving historic structures; and completing the redevelopment of remaining development sites. These include:

- **Establishing the foot of King Street as the gateway to the City** by extending the King Street pier out into the water, creating a signature harbor for Alexandria's waterfront and a hub for water taxis.
- **Rediscovering The Strand as a place for fun** with new parks offering activities for families and individuals, new waterfront dining options, historic ships, and highlighting The Strand as one of several **cultural anchors** along the waterfront with new opportunities to learn about Alexandria's history.
- **Creating new places for people to get together and enjoy themselves**, by adding approximately five acres of public space, including new public piers, new parks and plazas, re-opened alleys, pedestrian-oriented streets, and a continuous walkway along the waterfront.
- **Making sure new development contributes to our quality of life**, by guiding the transformation of three remaining development sites in the core

of the planning area: Robinson Terminal North and South and the 200 Block of Union Street, so as to provide restaurants and outdoor dining, hotels, retail, a marina, and adaptive reuse of the historic warehouses.

- **Sustaining our shoreline and environmental resources** by creating a more natural shoreline, introducing native plants, fortifying the bulkhead, and integrating flood mitigation.
- **Incorporating history** through interpretative activities and uses that reflect the history of the waterfront, architecture that recalls the past, adaptive reuse of buildings, use of materials in creating or enhancing public spaces and buildings, marking historical places, and more.
- **Incorporating art** through an art walk; public art and features; and creative, fun and educational art and cultural activity and utilizing art and history as unifying features along the waterfront.

B. Remaining Development Sites

Very few redevelopment sites remain along the waterfront. The Plan identifies three private sites, as depicted on page 84, and includes Development Goals and Guidelines for each one. The sites are:

- Robinson Terminal North
- Robinson Terminal South
- Cummings/Turner Block

Beyond technical regulatory provisions, the adopted land use plans that now govern the waterfront have little guidance for redevelopment. The Plan, with its Goals and Guidelines and other tools, provides greater clarity regarding the City's expectations for redevelopment and greater certainty that redevelopment will address public expectations. The more refined approach for each development site focuses on design, historic importance and amenities and, most importantly, each site's physical connection with the new public open spaces and facilities in the Plan.

As to each site, the Plan proposes opportunity for a mixed use scenario with active ground floor uses. A system of active frontages is integral in connecting waterfront places, as illustrated on pages 86 and 87 of the Plan. Further, the Plan proposes some increase to what existing zoning already permits, but does so with additional requirements. Thus, increases in density are permitted but only with SUP approval, and only if the proposed development is found to comply with the specific Development Goals and Guidelines outlined below.

Each of the Development sites will continue to be subject to the W-1 zone, but, as Section IV outlines, the zone text is proposed to be modified to allow hotels with SUP approval; to allow additional density with SUP approval; and to require compliance with the Development Goals and Guidelines in the Plan. No height limits are proposed to change with the exception of the portion of Robinson Terminal North to the west of Union Street, which is proposed to increase from 55 ft. to 66 ft. This change will align the Zoning Ordinance with the Height Districts for this area.

As to Robinson Terminal South and the Cummings/Turner block, each are located within both the Old and Historic Alexandria District and the Potomac River Vicinity Height District, making them already subject to design guidelines and standards in existing zoning regulations that will not change at sections 6-404 and 10-105(A)(4)).

IV. PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES

The W-1 zone was adopted as part of the City's Zoning Ordinance in 1982. It has remained relatively the same since that time, with some few changes in 1992. The zone has provided the development rights for several of the private properties developed since that time along the River, including Fords Landing, Harborside and Rivergate. The Plan recommends amending that zone as to the three remaining sites on the waterfront for which future private development is anticipated.

As discussed in great detail at pp. 84 - 101 in the Plan, these sites are currently zoned W-1 which already allows some development opportunities, and are subject to certain BAR and height district regulations. However, under the current W-1 Zone, the particular type and design of development that is most conducive to coexistence with public parks, activity and access ways along the waterfront is not as clearly defined. If the W-1 Zone is not changed, those sites are likely to develop as private townhouses.

It is significant to note that the proposed zoning changes to W-1 do not delete any rights that exist today. To the extent a developer prefers the existing zoning, with its permitted uses and densities, the ability to develop in accord with those rules continues. The additional use and density are provided as incentives to achieve the particular development and design the Plan has outlined as most desirable.

The following specific W-1 Zone changes are recommended, consistent with the information about uses, density and height in the Plan document itself *and relying on the Development Goals and Development Guidelines listed in the Plan document.*

1. Hotel Use: Amendment to section 5-503 to add hotels as a use, provided a SUP is approved and the development is consistent with the Design Goals and Guidelines in the Waterfront Plan for the site. A central part of the Plan is to encourage hotels as opposed to private residential uses, especially townhouses because residential essentially makes the land closest to the river private. The design

guidelines do provide some flexibility for residential uses, already allowed in the W-1 zone, but they are best on the blocks away from the river. However, residential development could still be allowed along the river if there is a showing that it can coexist with the planned public activity, provide a welcoming presence to visitors, and preferably not include permanent owner-occupied units. (See, e.g, for Robinson Terminal North, Guideline #4 at p. 90.)

2. FAR Increase: Amendment to section 5-504 to allow increased FAR for the three development sites, provided a SUP is approved and provided the development is consistent with the Design Goals and Guidelines in the Waterfront Plan for the site. The current densities allowed in the W-1 zone are lower than the maximum permitted under the 1983 Robinson Terminal Settlement Agreement with the Federal Government and City, and lower than what will permit a quality development with underground parking to be built. Therefore, the proposed zoning allows FAR up to the maximums provided in the 1983 Robinson Terminal Settlement Agreement, and consistent with the amounts shown in the chart on p. 101 of the Plan. A more detailed chart with additional information, including a before and after comparison of FAR for each part of each development is included as Attachment 12 – Detailed Zoning Chart. This table replaces the table located in the Plan document at p. 101. The table is expanded to show calculations for all of the individual parcels. In addition, it is expanded to show how the *entire* Cumming/Turner block could redevelop under the proposed zoning (the table in the Plan document assumed that some parcels would redevelop but others would not). The table is also revised to more accurately convey the potential for redevelopment under current zoning.

As an example, the chart shows that for Robinson Terminal North, current zoning allows a FAR of 2.0; the 1983 Settlement Agreement and proposed zoning actually allows an effective FAR of somewhat less than that, or 1.69. The lower number includes the entire land within the site in the calculation, although some of it may not be used for development. As to Robinson Terminal South, current zoning allows an FAR of 2.0; the 1983 Settlement Agreement and proposed zoning allow a bit more than that, or 2.32. For the Cummings Turner block, the proposed zoning increases the FAR from 2.0 to 3.0, but the increase is necessary to achieve a cohesive development of the block's separate parcels, as well as retention of the historic buildings. The physical model of the waterfront which has been on public display at City Hall for six weeks demonstrates the ability of these FAR numbers to result in buildings that are well designed, do not overwhelm the surrounding area, provide breaks through the blocks and significant open space, and otherwise work compatibly with the adjacent residential neighborhood as well as with nearby active open space areas.

In order to achieve the increased FAR, the zoning requires that the developments obtain SUP approval and comply with the long list of Development Goals and Guidelines set out in the Plan. Those Guidelines are detailed and tailored to address

the multitude of issues at each individual site while at the same time providing the City with an opportunity for enhanced development and quality design over what current zoning would produce.

3. Height Correction for one block: Amendment to section 5-507 to state that maximum heights throughout the W-1 Zone will be those that are shown on the height district maps. No height limits are proposed to change on any W-1 zoned land, with the exception of that portion of Robinson Terminal North that is west of North Union Street, which will change from 55 to 66 feet, consistent with the current height district map for that land and for the parcels nearby in Height District #4. (See Plan Figure 26, p. 85.) Nor does the zoning change the fact that, except for that one block, all the remaining developable land is within Height District #3 and is already required to obtain SUP approval for any height over 30 feet, and the process relies on certain design criteria and standards in the zoning ordinance at section 6-404.

4. Elimination of unsuitable uses: Amendment to section 5-503 to delete two uses: rooming house and tourist home. These uses, historically part of the City's Zoning Ordinance, including the W-1 zone, are not compatible or suitable for the City's waterfront. There are no existing developed parcels that would be appropriate for either a rooming house or tourist home; there have been no applications to use waterfront property for those uses in the last 30 years; and those uses would not be suitable or compatible with the development concepts for the future development sites.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of these zoning text changes because they allow reasonable development, compatible uses, and a design and scale of development particularly suitable for each of the development sites in the Plan.

V. SCHEDULE AND NEXT STEPS

The Planning Commission is scheduled to meet twice on this item, with the first meeting scheduled for April 5, 2011 and the second for May 3, 2011. City Council action is then anticipated in May and/or June 2011. Once adopted, there are a number of recommendations in the Plan which can begin immediately as the City prepares to undertake the phasing program outlined in Section II. Some immediate steps might include.

- (1) Working in partnership with the community on planning and organizational matters relating to implementation.
- (2) Continuing to interface with regulatory agencies to further discussion and processes regarding permitting.
- (3) Initiating the Parking Implementation Plan.

- (4) Preparing for solicitation of engineering and design studies.
- (5) Continuing to work with the art and history communities on implementation aspects of their plans.
- (6) Meeting with property owners regarding redevelopment sites.

VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- A. Initiate and adopt by Resolution the Waterfront Small Area Plan as an amendment to the City's Master Plan; and
- B. Initiate and recommend approval of the proposed text amendment revising Section 5-500 of the Zoning Ordinance, W-1/Waterfront mixed use zone.

VII. ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Master Plan Amendment Resolution
 - 2) Zoning Ordinance Text Changes
 - 3) April 22 Memo to the Planning Commission
 - 4) May 2 Combined Sewer Impacts Memo
 - 5) May 3 Guide to Text Changes Memo to Planning Commission
- The following attachments are under separate index tabs:
- 6) Waterfront Plan with Appendices
 - 7) Flood Mitigation
 - 8) Parking
 - 9) Restaurant Building
 - 10) Costs/Revenues/Phasing
 - 11) Hotel Use Analysis
 - 12) Detailed Zoning Chart
 - 13) Letters

RESOLUTION NO. **MPA 2011-0001**

WHEREAS, under the Provisions of Section 9.05 of the City Charter, the Planning Commission may adopt amendments to the Master Plan of the City of Alexandria and submit to the City Council such revisions in said plan as changing conditions may make necessary; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, Department of Planning and Zoning staff began the process to create the Waterfront Small Area Plan as a proposed amendment to the City's 1992 Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the boundaries for the Waterfront Small Area Plan consist of Daingerfield Island at its north end and Jones Point Park at its southern end (both national parks). In between, the plan is bounded to the east by the Potomac River and to the west by (from north to south) East Abingdon Drive beginning just north of Marina Drive to the railroad tracks, Continuing southeast along the railroad tracks to a point just west of Pitt Street, Continuing east along Bashford Lane to North Royal Street, Continuing south along North Royal Street to Third Street, Continuing east along Third Street to North Fairfax Street, Continuing south along North Fairfax Street to Queen Street, Continuing east along Queen Street to a point approximately 100 feet west of North Union Street, Continuing south about 100 feet west of Union Street to Wolfe Street, Following along the northern, western, and southern boundary of Windmill Hill Park until it meets South Union Street, Continuing south on South Union Street to Jones Point Park; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Planning and Zoning has held nearly 100 meetings and events since 2009 with the community, City staff, technical experts, and work sessions with Planning Commission and City Council to gather information and ideas, and to create a vision, goals, and guiding principles for the Waterfront Small Area Plan; and

WHEREAS, these efforts have resulted in the proposed Waterfront Small Area Plan chapter of the City's 1992 Master Plan which is designed to promote an expansion of open and public space, visual and physical connectivity, wider opportunities for water-oriented and land-side recreation, adaptive reuse of historic buildings, and guidelines for the limited number of remaining redevelopment sites along the waterfront; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission heard a presentation and held a public hearing on the amendment to the City's 1992 Master Plan to create a Waterfront Small Area Plan chapter on April 5, 2011; and

WHEREAS, after hearing such presentation and public testimony, the Planning Commission voted to initiate the amendment to the City's 1992 Master Plan to create the Waterfront Small Area Plan chapter on May 3, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that:

1. The proposed amendment is necessary and desirable to guide and accomplish the coordinated, harmonious, and sustainable use, development and enjoyment of the **Waterfront Small Area** section of the City; and
2. The proposed amendment is consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the 1992 Master Plan; and
3. The proposed amendment shows the Planning Commission's long-range and sustainable recommendations for the general development of the **Waterfront Small Area Plan**; and
4. Based on the foregoing findings and all other facts and circumstances of which the Planning Commission may properly take notice in making and adopting a master plan for the City of Alexandria, adoption of the amendment for the **Waterfront Small Area Plan** chapter of the 1992 Master Plan will, in accordance with present and probable future needs and resources, best promote the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare of the residents of the City;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Alexandria that:

1. The attached document titled Alexandria Waterfront Draft Small Area Plan dated February 25, 2011, any appendices to such document and as such documents may have been amended by the Planning Commission on May 3, 2011 are hereby adopted as an amendment to the 1992 Master Plan of the City of Alexandria, Virginia in accordance with Section 9.05 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, Virginia creating the **Waterfront Small Area Plan** chapter of said Master Plan.
2. This resolution shall be signed by the Chairman of the Planning Commission and attested by its secretary, and a true copy of this resolution forwarded and certified to the City Council.

ADOPTED the **3rd day of May, 2011.**

John Komoroske, Chairman
Alexandria Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Faroll Hamer, Secretary

PROPOSED ZONING TEXT CHANGES

Sec. 5-500 W-1/Waterfront mixed use zone.

- 5-501 Purpose. The W-1 zone is intended to promote mixed use development with suitable public amenities along appropriate portions of the city's waterfront by permitting a mixture of residential, commercial, cultural and institutional uses and by allowing greater densities than would otherwise be permitted to the extent the proposed mix of uses, the design and the location warrant.
- 5-502 Permitted uses. The following uses are permitted in the W-1 zone:
- (A) Single-family dwelling;
 - (A.1) Two-family dwelling;
 - (A.2) Townhouse dwelling;
 - (B) Multifamily dwelling;
 - (C) Business and professional office;
 - (D) Public building;
 - (E) Public park, athletic field or other outdoor recreation facility;
 - (F) Public utility service yard and/or electrical receiving or transforming station, provided the use and/or structure was in existence prior to 1982 and the use has been continued thereafter;
 - (G) Accessory uses, as permitted by section 7-100.
- 5-503 Special uses. The following uses may be allowed in the W-1 zone pursuant to a special use permit:
- (A) Commercial outdoor recreation facility;
 - (B) Commercial shipping and freight terminal;
 - (C) Facilities used for docking or berthing of boats or ships, including public or private marinas and/or boat docks with related facilities limited to water and electricity connections;
 - (D) Health and athletic club;
 - (E) Home for the elderly;
 - (F) Nursery school;
 - (G) Outdoor food and crafts market;
 - (H) Personal service establishment;
 - (I) Privately owned public use building such as civic auditorium or performing arts center;
 - (J) Restaurant;
 - (K) Retail shopping establishment;
 - ~~(L) Rooming house;~~
 - ~~(M) Tourist home;~~
 - (N) Utilities, as permitted by section 7-1200.
 - (O) Hotel, consistent with the Development Goals and Guidelines for Development Sites in the Waterfront small area plan.

- 5-503.1 Prohibited uses. Any use which is not a permitted, special or accessory use pursuant to this section 5-500 is prohibited.
- 5-504 Floor area ratio. The permitted floor area ratio of a development in the W-1 zone depends on whether a single use or mixture of uses is proposed and whether a special use permit is sought.
- (A) *Single use.* If a parcel is developed for only commercial use or for only residential use, the maximum permitted floor area ratio is:
 - (1) Commercial: .75, or
 - (2) Residential: 1.0In the case of either (1) or (2), an additional .25 of retail use is permitted.
 - (B) *Mixed use.* If a parcel is developed for both commercial and residential use, and the residential use constitutes at least 25 percent of the floor space of the development, the maximum permitted floor area ratio is 1.0 plus an additional .25 of retail use.
 - (C) *Mixed use or residential/SUP.* If at least 50 percent of the floor space of the proposed development is for residential use and if the commercial use within such a development does not exceed a floor area ratio of .75, then, with a special use permit, the maximum permitted floor area ratio may be increased to an amount not to exceed 2.0.
 - (D) Development sites in waterfront plan/SUP. For property that is part of a development site identified in the waterfront small area plan, with a special use permit, the maximum floor area ratio may be increased provided the development meets and is consistent with the Development Goals and Guidelines listed in the Waterfront plan for the property.
- 5-505 *Density and lot requirements.*
- (A) *Density.* Gross density shall not exceed 30 dwelling units per acre.
 - (B) *Lot size.*
 - (1) Each structure containing multifamily dwellings shall be located on a lot with a minimum of 1,452 square feet of land area for each dwelling unit.
 - (2) Each townhouse dwelling shall be located on a lot with a minimum of 1452 square feet of land area.
 - (3) Each other principal use shall be located on a lot with no minimum land area requirement except that which occurs as a result of other applicable regulations, such as yards, floor area ratio and parking.
 - (C) *Lot width and frontage.*
 - (1) For multifamily dwellings, the minimum lot width at the front lot and building line shall be 50 feet.
 - (2) For townhouses, the minimum lot width at the front lot and building line shall be 18 feet for all lots except interior lots for which the minimum lot width at the front lot and building line shall be 26 feet.

- (3) For all other principal uses, there shall be no minimum lot and building line requirements except those which occur as a result of other applicable regulations.

5-506 *Yard requirements.*

- (A) *Front yard.* No front yard is required except as may be applicable pursuant to the supplemental yard and setback regulations of section 7-1000 and the zone transition requirements of section 7-900.
- (B) *Side yards.* No side yards are required except in the following cases:
- (1) Each interior end unit in a group of townhouses shall provide a side yard of at least 8 feet.
 - (2) Multifamily residential buildings shall provide two side yards based on a setback ratio of 1:2 and a minimum of 16 feet.
- (C) *Rear yard.* Each lot shall provide a rear yard of at least 8 feet, except that each multifamily residential building shall provide a rear yard based on a setback ratio of 1:2 and a minimum distance of 16 feet.

5-507 *Height.* The maximum permitted height of buildings is ~~55 feet.~~ the height shown in the applicable height district map.

5-508 *Open and usable space.* Residential uses shall provide a minimum of 300 square feet of open and usable space per dwelling unit, exclusive of any area required for off-street parking. The location and shape of such space shall be subject to the director's determination that it is functional and usable space for residents, visitors and other persons. Such open space may be located on landscaped roofs or other areas fully open to the sky which are not at ground level and which are accessible to all residents of the development if the director determines that such space functions as open space for residents to the same extent that ground level open space would. In addition, each use, development or project adjacent to the Potomac River shall provide an open space walkway and bike way adjacent to the high watermark of the Potomac River.

5-509 *Ground floor occupancy regulations.*

- (A) No room or space used for residential purposes or commercial purposes, other than restaurant or retail room or space, shall be permitted on the ground floor of any building.
- (B) The provisions of section 5-509(A) shall not apply if publicly accessible waterfront or waterfront-related amenities are provided in conjunction with a proposed building, subject to approval of a site plan for such amenities and building pursuant to section 11-400.
- (C) Publicly accessible waterfront or waterfront-related amenities may include, but are not limited to, pedestrians walkways and landscaped open space areas connected to the walkway/bikeway required along the waterfront by section 5-508, boat docking facilities, or similar improvements that enhance pedestrian access to and enjoyment of the waterfront area. The planning commission, or city council on appeal,

shall approve the site plan submitted pursuant to section 5-509(B) if the commission or council in its reasonable discretion determines that the amenities to be provided enhance the publicly oriented vitality of the waterfront area.

- (D) As used in this section 5-509, "ground floor" means that floor of a building which is approximately or most nearly level with the ground surface in the general vicinity of the building and includes the headroom above such floor.
- (E) The residential building exclusions of section 11-404(A) shall not apply to any site plan submitted under the provisions of this section 5-500. Nothing in this section 5-509 shall excuse compliance with the use regulations of this section 5-500, including any requirement for a special use permit of section 5-503, or with the floodplain regulations of section 6-300.
- (F) Any ground floor room or space used for residential purposes or commercial purposes other than restaurant or retail room or space, in a building for which a preliminary site plan was approved on or before June 28, 1988, shall be deemed to meet the requirements of this section 5-509.

5-510 *Underground utilities.* All developments containing new or replacement utility facilities within the development shall provide for underground installation of said facilities.

5-511 *Use limitations.* Health club use shall include health, athletic, and bath clubs or establishments, massage establishment, including facilities incidental to such uses; provided, however, that a special use permit granted for the operation of a massage establishment as defined in section 11-4-1 of the city code shall apply exclusively to the permittee named therein and shall not be transferable to any other firm or individual. 5-512 Additional regulations for single-family, two-family and townhouse dwellings.

- (A) *Lot size.* Each single-family dwelling shall be located on a lot with a minimum land area of 5,000 square feet. In the case of a two-family dwelling, the lot shall contain 2,500 square feet of land area for each dwelling unit.
- (B) *Frontage.* When measured at both the front lot line and the front building line, each single-family dwelling and two-family duplex dwelling requires a minimum of 50 feet of frontage, and a semi-detached dwelling requires a minimum frontage of 37.5 feet for each dwelling unit.
- (C) *Yards.* For residential uses the following yard requirements apply: Each single-family, and two-family dwelling shall provide a front yard of 20 feet; a rear yard based on a 1:1 setback ratio and a minimum of eight feet; and side yards based on a 1:3 setback ratio and a minimum of eight feet. Each interior end unit townhouse shall provide a side yard based on a 1:3 setback ratio and a minimum of eight feet.

- (D) *Mixed use.* When a development includes both residential and nonresidential uses, the residential lot size, frontage and yard regulations shall be applicable to the residential component of the development.

5-513 *Accessory apartments.* One or two apartment dwelling units, located on a floor or floors above retail or commercial uses, shall be permitted as an accessory use. Such apartments shall be categorized as nonresidential for the purpose of applying the area and bulk regulations of this zone, and each such apartment shall provide the parking required for a multifamily dwelling unit of equivalent size.

(Ord. No. 3606, §§ 6--9, 12-12-92; Ord. No. 3612, §§ 1, 3, 1-23-93; Ord. No. 3629, §§ 1--4, 5-15-93; Ord. No. 3753, § 1, 9-27-94)